

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

JULIE ANNE CHINNOCK,

Plaintiff,

vs.

NAVIENT CORPORATION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Case No. 1:18-cv-2935

NOTICE & ORDER

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

The personal jurisdiction question in this case continues to fester, largely because Plaintiff Julie Anne Chinnock inexplicably failed to comply with the Court's March 1, 2019 order to submit personal jurisdiction evidence.

In her verified complaint, Chinnock alleges Ohio jurisdiction. She claims that Defendants solicited her loan transactions in Ohio, transmitted loan approval in Ohio, and disbursed loan funds to Ohio educational institutions.¹ She also claims she made monthly loan payments from or to Ohio.²

Conversely, Defendants Navient Corporation, Navient Solutions, LLC, and Navient Student Loan Trust 2014-3 (the "Navient Defendants") argue that they have never known Plaintiff to live in Ohio.³ Further, they produce documents showing that Plaintiff's loans were requested in states other than Ohio and distributed to schools outside Ohio.⁴

To resolve these factual disputes, the Court will hold a hearing on whether it has

¹ Doc. 1-1 at 14–15.

² *Id.*

³ Docs. 25, 25-1.

⁴ *Id.*

Case No. 1:18-cv-2935

Gwin, J.

personal jurisdiction over the Navient Defendants on April 12, 2019 at noon. The Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff Chinnock to appear at that hearing. The Court **ORDERS** the Navient Defendants to appear through a representative or representatives authorized to testify on their behalf and with knowledge relevant to the question of personal jurisdiction.⁵

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 27, 2019

s/ *James S. Gwin*
JAMES S. GWIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

⁵ In short, the Navient Defendants must send a witness equivalent to one described in [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30\(b\)\(6\)](#).